

**THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN
NON-SINGLET CONTRIBUTIONS TO g_1^N AND F_1^N
STRUCTURE FUNCTIONS WITHIN INFRARED
RENORMALON MODEL ***

A. L. KATAEV

Institute for Nuclear Research of the Academy of Sciences of Russia
Moscow 117312, Russia
E-mail: kataev@ms2.inr.ac.ru

We report on the following consequences of the relations between non-singlet contributions to g_1^N and F_1^N structure functions found within infrared renormalon model: the discovery of new next-to-leading order inequalities between non-singlet polarized and unpolarized parton densities, and the existence of the effects of similarity between non-perturbative and perturbative contributions to the unpolarized and polarized Bjorken sum rules.

1 Introduction

The infrared renormalon approach is the popular model for simulating the behavior of the high-twist corrections in the $\overline{MS}$ -scheme (see the reviews of Refs.[1, 2] and the recent application of Ref.[3]). In particular, in Ref.[4] the prediction for the x -shape of the twist-4 contributions to the non-singlet (NS) structure function (SF) xF_3 and the NS parts of SFs g_1^N and F_1^N were obtained. It should be stressed, that the qualitative validity of the IRR model for twist-4 term of xF_3 SF from Ref. [4] was confirmed during the NLO fits of Refs.[5] (for the brief discussions see the talks of Ref.[6]). In this report we will use the machinery of the IRR model to find definite relations, induced by the IRR model predictions of Ref.[4] for the $1/Q^2$ corrections to the NS parts of g_1^N and F_1^N SFs (see Ref.[7]) and for the Bjorken sum rules (both polarized and unpolarized [8]).

*This work is supported by the RFBR Grants Nos.02-01-00601,03-02-17047 and 03-02-17177

2 The bounds on the NS polarized parton densities

Let us consider the expression for the asymmetry of photon-nucleon polarized DIS, which in general has the following form

$$A_1^N(x, Q^2) = (1 + \gamma^2) \frac{g_1^N(x, Q^2)}{F_1^N(x, Q^2)} + \frac{h^{A_1}(x)}{Q^2} \quad (1)$$

where $\gamma = 4M_N^2 x^2 / Q^2$ and the second term in the r.h.s. of Eq. (1) is the dynamical $1/Q^2$ correction. It should be stressed, that the recent results of the fits to combined CERN, DESY and SLAC polarized DIS data in the kinematic region $0.005 \leq x \leq 0.75$ and $1 \text{ GeV}^2 \leq 58 \text{ GeV}^2$ demonstrated, that the x -shape of $h^{A_1}(x)$ is consistent with zero [9]. This effect is leading to the conclusion that

$$\frac{h^{g_1}(x)}{Q^2 g_1^N(x, Q^2)} \approx \frac{h^{F_1}(x)}{Q^2 F_1^N(x, Q^2)} \quad . \quad (2)$$

Using now the well-known inequality

$$|g_1^N(x, Q^2)| \leq F_1^N(x, Q^2) \quad (3)$$

we get [7], that

$$|h^{g_1}(x)| \leq |h^{F_1}(x)| \quad . \quad (4)$$

It should be stressed that the IRR model considerations of Ref.[4] predict that in the NS approximation $h^{F_1}(x)$ and $h^{F_3}(x)$ have the same form, namely

$$h^{F_1}(x, \mu^2) = h^{F_3}(x, \mu^2) = A_2' \int_x^1 \frac{dz}{z} C_1(z) q^{NS}(x/z, \mu^2) \quad (5)$$

where $C_1(z) = -4/(1+x)_+ + 2(2+x+2x^2) - 5\delta(x) - \delta'(1-x)$ is the calculated in Ref.[4] IRR model coefficient function and

$$q^{NS}(x, \mu^2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} \left(e_i^2 - \frac{1}{n_f} \sum_{k=1}^{n_f} e_k^2 \right) (q_i(x, \mu^2) + \bar{q}(x, \mu^2)) \quad (6)$$

are the NS parton densities, μ^2 is the normalization point of order 1 GeV^2 and A_2' is the IRR model parameter, which should be extracted from the fits of concrete data. It should be noted that the identity of Eq. (5) does not contradict point of view that to study the Q^2 behavior of $A_1(Q^2)$ in the NS

approximation it might be convenient to use the concrete xF_3 data instead of theoretical expression for F_1^N [10].

In the case of NS approximation for the g_1^N SF the IRR result of Ref.[4] has the following form

$$h^{g_1}(x, \mu^2) = A_2 \int_x^1 \frac{dz}{z} C_1(z) \Delta^{NS}(x/z, \mu^2) \quad (7)$$

where the IRR model coefficient function has the same expression as in the case of the IRR model predictions for $h^{F_1}(x, \mu^2)$ and

$$\Delta^{NS}(x, \mu^2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} \left(e_i^2 - \frac{1}{n_f} \sum_{k=1}^{n_f} e_k^2 \right) (\Delta q_i(x, \mu^2) + \Delta \bar{q}_i(x, \mu^2)) \quad (8)$$

are the NS polarized parton densities. Combining now the NS expressions for $h^{F_1}(x, \mu^2)$ and $h^{g_1}(x, \mu^2)$ we arrive to the main result of the work of Ref.[7], namely

$$|A_2 \Delta^{NS}(x, \mu^2)| \leq |A_2' q^{NS}(x, \mu^2)| \quad (9)$$

which is valid both at the LO and NLO. In the case of $|A_2| \sim |A_2'|$ assumed in Ref.[4], this inequality is similar to the LO bound of Ref. [11], namely

$$|\Delta(x, Q^2)| \leq q(x, Q^2) \quad (10)$$

3 The relations between renormalon contributions to unpolarized and polarized Bjorken sum rules

It should be stressed that the relations between renormalon contributions to NS parts of g_1^N and F_1^N SFs are also manifesting themselves in the case of consideration of theoretical predictions for the unpolarized Bjorken sum rule

$$C_{Bj unp} = \int_0^1 dx \left[F_1^{\nu p}(x, Q^2) - F_1^{\nu n}(x, Q^2) \right] \quad (11)$$

and polarized Bjorken sum rule

$$\int_0^1 dx \left[g_1^p(x, Q^2) - g_1^n(x, Q^2) \right] = \frac{1}{3} \left| \frac{g_A}{g_V} \right| C_{Bjp}(Q^2) \quad (12)$$

which were calculated in the large N_F -limit in Ref.[8] and in Ref. [12] correspondingly. Indeed, the large N_F -limit of the perturbative part of unpolarized Bjorken sum rule has the following form [8]

$$\begin{aligned} C_{Bj unp} &= 1 + \frac{C_F}{T_F N_F} \sum_n U_n \left(T_F N_F \bar{a}_s \right)^n + O(1/N_F^2) \\ U_n &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left(-\frac{4}{3} \frac{d}{d\delta} \right)^{n-1} U(\delta) \\ U(\delta) &= -\frac{2 \exp(5\delta/3)}{(1-\delta)(1-\delta^2/4)} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The large N_F -expression for the Bjorken polarized sum rule can be obtained from the following equations [12]:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{Bjp} &= 1 + \frac{C_F}{T_F N_F} \sum_n K_n \left(T_F N_F \bar{a}_s \right)^n + O(1/N_F^2) \\ K_n &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left(-\frac{4}{3} \frac{d}{d\delta} \right)^{n-1} K(\delta) \\ K(\delta) &= -\frac{(3+\delta) \exp(5\delta/3)}{(1-\delta^2)(1-\delta^2/4)} . \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Notice that like in the case discussed in the previous Section, the renormalon contributions to unpolarized and polarized Bjorken sum rules are related as

$$K(\delta) = \left(\frac{3+\delta}{2(1+\delta)} \right) U(\delta) . \quad (15)$$

This, in turn, results in the similarity between twist-4 contributions to both sum rules and explains the similarity between perturbative theory predictions to both sum rules, observed in Ref. [13]. More detailed studies of the consequences of the results of this Section are on the agenda.

References

- [1] M. Beneke, Phys. Rept. **317** (1999) 1 [hep-ph/9807443].
- [2] M. Beneke and V. M. Braun, hep-ph/0010208.

- [3] D. J. Broadhurst, A. L. Kataev and C. J. Maxwell, Nucl. Phys. B **592** (2001) 247 [hep-ph/0007152].
- [4] M. Dasgupta and B. R. Webber, Phys. Lett. B **382** (1996) 273 [hep-ph/9604388].
- [5] A. L. Kataev, A. V. Kotikov, G. Parente and A. V. Sidorov, Phys. Lett. B **417** (1998) 374 [hep-ph/9706534];
 S. I. Alekhin and A. L. Kataev, Phys. Lett. B **452** (1999) 402 [hep-ph/9812348];
 A. L. Kataev, G. Parente and A. V. Sidorov, Nucl. Phys. B **573** (2000) 405 [hep-ph/9905310];
 A. L. Kataev, G. Parente and A. V. Sidorov, Phys. Part. Nucl. **34** (2003) 20 [Fiz. Elem. Chast. Atom. Yadra **34** (2003) 43] [hep-ph/0106221].
- [6] A. L. Kataev, G. Parente and A. V. Sidorov, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **116** (2003) 105 [hep-ph/0211151];
 A. L. Kataev, G. Parente and A. V. Sidorov, J. Phys. **G** (2003) (in press), hep-ph/0209024.
- [7] A. L. Kataev, JETP Lett. **77** (2003) 458, [hep-ph/0302101].
- [8] D. J. Broadhurst and A. L. Kataev, Phys. Lett. B **544** (2002) 154 [hep-ph/0207261].
- [9] E. Leader, A. V. Sidorov and D. B. Stamenov, Eur. Phys. J. C **23** (2002) 479 [arXiv:hep-ph/0111267];
 E. Leader, A. V. Sidorov and D. B. Stamenov, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 074017 [hep-ph/0212085].
- [10] A. V. Kotikov and D. V. Peshekhonov, Eur. Phys. J. C **9** (1999) 55 [hep-ph/9810224].
- [11] G. Altarelli, S. Forte and G. Ridolfi, Nucl. Phys. B **534** (1998) 277 [hep-ph/9806345].
- [12] D. J. Broadhurst and A. L. Kataev, Phys. Lett. B **315** (1993) 179 [hep-ph/9308274].
- [13] E. Gardi and M. Karliner, Nucl. Phys. B **529** (1998) 383 [hep-ph/9802218].